

103D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. RES. 21

To authorize testimony and to authorize representation by the Senate Legal Counsel.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JANUARY 21 (legislative day, JANUARY 5), 1993

Mr. MITCHELL (for himself and Mr. DOLE) submitted the following resolution;
which was considered and agreed to

RESOLUTION

To authorize testimony and to authorize representation by
the Senate Legal Counsel.

Whereas, the parties in Willey v. Riley, et al., numbered LA
18962, pending in the Iowa district court for Linn Coun-
ty, seek the deposition testimony of Senator Grassley;

Whereas, by rule VI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, no
Senator shall absent himself from the service of the Sen-
ate without leave;

Whereas, by the privileges of the Senate of the United States
and rule XI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, no evi-
dence under the control or in the possession of the Sen-
ate can, by administrative or judicial process, be taken
from such control or possession but by permission of the
Senate;

Whereas, when it appears that evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate is needed for the promotion of justice, the Senate will take such action as will promote the ends of justice consistent with the privileges of the Senate;

Whereas, pursuant to sections 703(a) and 704(a)(2) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (2 U.S.C. 288b(a) and 288c(a)(2)), the Senate may direct its counsel to represent Members of the Senate with respect to requests for testimony made to them in their official capacities: Now, therefore, be it

1 *Resolved*, That Senator Grassley is authorized to tes-
 2 tify at a deposition in Willey v. Riley, et al., case numbered
 3 LA 18962 (Iowa D.Ct.), except when his attendance at
 4 the Senate is necessary for the performance of his legisla-
 5 tive duties, and except concerning matters for which a
 6 privilege should be asserted.

7 SEC. 2. The Senate Legal Counsel is authorized to
 8 represent Senator Grassley in connection with his testi-
 9 mony in the case of Willey v. Riley, et al.

○